

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/540,529

Applicant(s)

MURATA, KIYOHITO

Examiner

Diem Tran

Art Unit

3748

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Diem Tran. (3) _____

(2) James W. Edmondson. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 15 June 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wossner et al. (US 4,023,360), Ban et al. (US 6,571,552).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that the Wossner reference fails to disclose controlling the exhaust gas flowing through the second passage (i.e. bypass the emission control unit) based on the temperature of emission control unit. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, since the Wossner reference discloses that the exhaust gas is detoured into the bypass passage (i.e. bypass the reactor) when a particular mass flow rate is reached and an overheating of the reactor must be expected (see col. 1, lines 52-54). The Applicant will submit an amendment and the Examiner will consider when a formal amendment is submitted.